

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 22 is amended by the present amendment. Support for amended Claim 22 can be found in the originally filed specification, claims and drawings.¹ No new matter is added.

In the Office Action, Claims 22 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,216,158, herein Luo) in view of Russell (U.S. Pat. 5,729,220); and Claims 23, 24 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo in view of Russell and Sudo (EP 0797336).

Claims 22 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo in view of Russell. In response to this rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 22 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 22 recites, in part, an information processing system, wherein

...the information processing device is configured to respond to said driving signal and said identification ID by verifying said identification ID has access according to registered ID information, and configured to, if access is permitted, transmit to said remote controller terminal ***previously set item data***, and

the information processing device includes ***an interface configured to receive an input selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as the previously set item data and associate the selected previously set item data with the remote controller...***

As disclosed in an exemplary embodiment at Figs. 4A-4B and pp. 9-11 of the specification, the item data transmitted to the remote controller is selected using a user interface of the information processing device. The selected item data is associated with the

¹ E.g., specification, Figs 4A-4B and pp. 9-11.

remote controller, so that when the remote controller controls the interface of the information processing device, only the previously set data items (representing a subset of the data items available at the information processing device) are transmitted to the remote controller.

Turning to the applied references, Luo describes a system and method using a palm sized computer to control network devices. More particularly, Luo describes that a program on the palm sized computer is used to access a registry 120 of network services that may be available. The registry 120 includes descriptions for various services, and each description includes at least a reference to program code that can be downloaded to the palm sized computer. Execution of the downloaded programs causes the palm sized computer to issue commands directly to the specific network services.²

Luo, however, fails to teach or suggest that the remotely controlled information processing device transmits previously set item data to the remote controller based on the controller's ID, the previously set item data being determined by "an interface configured to receive an input selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as the previously set item data and associate the selected previously set item data with the remote controller," as recited in amended independent Claim 22. More particularly, Luo fails to teach or suggest that any of the devices remotely controlled by the palm sized computer 100, include an interface that receives an input selecting a subset of data that may be associated with, and transmitted to, the palm sized computer 100 based on a received ID of the palm sized computer. Moreover, Luo describes that the palm sized computer 100 (e.g. remote controller) issues commands to the specific network services that it controls, and fails to teach or suggest that the palm sized computer receives any data from these controlled services, much less that it receives data as defined in amended Claim 22

² Luo, Abstract.

Instead, at col. 3, ll. 42-67, for example, Luo describes that the palm sized computer 100 selects an application for which control is desired, and downloads the appropriate executable files needed to remotely control network resources to execute the application. In one example, Luo describes that the palm sized computer 100 accesses network resources to locate elements required to remotely control a presentation located on the network. The palm sized computer 100 uses an application service 130 (to run PowerPoint), a persistent storage service 150 (to store the presentation), and a display service 140 (to display the presentation images). Once the palm sized computer 100 has located the necessary services, it downloads the code required to control those services (using the lookup and download protocols). The palm sized computer 100 is then capable of directly controlling the services it requires.

However, none of the resources controlled by the palm sized computer 100 transmit previously set item data to the palm sized computer 100 based on the computer's ID, the previously set item data being determined by "an interface configured to receive an input selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as the previously set item data and associate the selected previously set item data with the remote controller," as recited in amended independent Claim 22. As noted above in an exemplary embodiment, the information processing device (e.g. PC 2), which is to be remotely controlled by the remote controller (e.g. mobile phone 3), selects a subset of item data that is associated with the remote controller. When the information processing device receives a request to be controlled by the remote controller, the information processing device transmits the selected subset of data to the remote controller based on the remote controller's ID.

On the other hand, none of the components in Luo that are remotely controlled by the palm sized computer 100, include such an interface to associate a subset of data with the

palm sized computer 100. Moreover, none of the network services to be controlled in Luo transmit data to the palm sized computer 100 based on an ID of the computer, as claimed.

Further, neither Russell nor Sudo cure any of the above noted deficiencies of Luo. Therefore, Luo, Russell and Sudo, neither alone, nor in combination, teach or suggest a remote controller that receives previous set data items determined by “an interface configured to receive an input selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as the previously set item data and associating the selected previously set item data with the remote controller,” as recited in amended independent Claim 22.

Accordingly, as Luo, Russell, and Sudo do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 22 (and Claims 23-28 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Luo, Russell, and Sudo.

Consequently, in view of the present Amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 22-28 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)